

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
HOT SPRINGS DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PLAINTIFF

v.

Case No. 6:15-cr-60011

JACOB SPURLIN

DEFENDANT

ORDER

Before the Court is Defendant Jacob Spurlin's Motion for Termination of Supervision. ECF No. 72. The government has filed a response. ECF No. 73. The Court finds the matter ripe for consideration.

On March 30, 2016, Defendant was sentenced to eighty-four (84) months in prison followed by three (3) years of supervised release for the offense of conspiracy to distribute methamphetamine in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1) and 846. Defendant was released from prison on September 21, 2021, and began his term of supervised release in the Western District of Arkansas, Hot Springs Division.

On October 27, 2023, Defendant filed the instant motion seeking early termination of his supervised release. Defendant has served approximately twenty-six (26) months of his imposed thirty-six (36) months of supervised release. The government opposes early termination of Defendant's supervised release.

Defendant reports that he is responsible for caring for his ailing wife, father, and in-laws. Defendant states that he is a productive member of his community, attends religious services regularly, and is working to rebuild certain family relationships. Defendant tested positive for the use of marijuana on November 5, 2021, November 19, 2021, December 10, 2021, January 4, 2022, December 13, 2023, and February 21, 2024. He has struggled to maintain employment since

beginning his term of supervised release and has been unemployed since the end of July 2023.

A district court may terminate supervised release “if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by conduct of the defendant released and the interest of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1). In making its determination, the Court must consider factors set forth under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), to the extent they are applicable. The section 3553(a) factors include, among others, the nature and circumstances of the offense, the history and characteristics of the defendant, the need to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant, the need to provide just punishment for the offense, and the need to promote respect for the law.

Upon consideration of the factors listed above, the Court finds that Defendant’s motion (ECF No. 72) should be and hereby is **DENIED** due to Defendant’s history of failed drug tests while on supervised release, his inability to maintain employment longer than nine months while on supervised release, and the need to promote respect for the law.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 18th day of April, 2024.

/s/ Susan O. Hickey
Susan O. Hickey
Chief United States District Judge